

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDRES GOMEZ,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
VINTAGE WINE ESTATES, INC.,  
Defendant.

Case No. 22-cv-01610-VC

**ORDER LIFTING ORDER TO SHOW  
CAUSE**

Re: Dkt. No. 13

1. When a “high-frequency” litigant asserts a California Unruh Act claim in federal court alongside an ADA claim, this will typically constitute an exceptional circumstance that justifies dismissal of the Unruh Act claim. *See Arroyo v. Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202, 1211–14 (9th Cir. 2021); *Garcia v. Maciel*, 2022 WL 395316, at \*2–5 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2022). However, such exceptional circumstances only exist where the plaintiff has filed a “construction-related accessibility claim.” *Arroyo*, 19 F.4th at 1206. The plaintiff’s claim in this case—alleging that a website is inaccessible—is not a construction-related accessibility claim. There are therefore no exceptional circumstances that would justify dismissal of the Unruh Act claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1337(c)(4).

2. Given the low bar required to establish that a plaintiff has standing to seek injunctive relief in ADA challenges to a website’s alleged inaccessibility, there is no basis (at this time) to dismiss the claim for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Additionally, the Court does not think that jurisdictional discovery would be fruitful (although the defendant may file a motion requesting jurisdictional discovery if it can articulate a basis for doing so).

3. The Court is skeptical that the plaintiff has stated a claim under the ADA, as the

complaint does not explain how the website's alleged shortcomings prevented the plaintiff from visiting the defendant's physical location or accessing its goods or services. *See Gomez v. Rang Dong Joint Stock Co.*, 2022 WL 2254995, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2022).

4. A status report is due by September 28, 2022.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 29, 2022



---

VINCE CHHABRIA  
United States District Judge